

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/901,907	07/11/2001	Veronique Guillou	210231US0	7859		
22850 7	590 05/02/2005		EXAMINER			
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			YU, GINA C			
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1617			
				DATE MAILED: 05/02/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/901,907	GUILLOU ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Gina C. Yu	1617

	Examino:	Air oille				
	Gina C. Yu	1617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 09 March 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF						
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:</li> </ol>	n the same day as filing a Notice o owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid ab ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv</li> </ul>						
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee.  Satutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action: or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be a since a Notice of Appeal has been filed.</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	·	`	•			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO	f, will <u>not</u> be entered l TE below);	oecause			
<ul> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in belappeal; and/or</li> </ul>		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		jected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	<b>)</b> :					
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ill be entered and an	explanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-25</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> . <u>AFFIDAVIT OR</u> OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	it before or on the date of filing a N	lation of Apparal will m	at ha autawad			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence i	s necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	Is to provide a			
10.  ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see continuation.</li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).  13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper <b>i</b>	Madra	John .			
		ENI PADMANABH				
	SUPERVI	SORY PATENT EX	AMINER			

He

Art Unit: 1617

## Continuation of No. 10:

Examiner maintains the position that the difference between the claimed invention and comparison examples do not amount to unexpected or surprising results. Declarant refers to the differences of the present invention and Examples 2 or 3 in foam volume, size of the bubbles, density of the foam, and rinsing properties. However, there is not difference between the invention and Example 2 in foam volume and size of the bubbles, density of the foam; and between the invention and Example 3. Furthermore, it is still unclear what these numbers in the table represent; while applicants assert that spec. p.17-18 explains how the data was measured, the only measurement with scientific and objective unit is the turbidity.

## Continuation of No. 11:

Applicants' remark that smaller bubble size, higher foam density, and improved rinsibility provide more desirable physical properties for cleansing composition, is noted. In response, the fact that applicant as recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985). In this case, the use of the applicants' cationic polymers in personal cleansing art is well known in the art. Examiner takes the position that the observed properties of the cationic polymers used in the present invention would have been obvious to a skilled artisan.

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gina C. Yu whose telephone number is 571-272-0635.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner